DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 307 95 SP 008 437

AUTHOR Minskoff, Esther Hirsch
TITLE Increasing Teaching Efficiency through a Program of Personal Development and Enrichment of Perceptual-Linguistic and Motor Skills in Prospective Teachers. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Southern Connecticut State Coll., New Haven.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [72]
GRANT OEG-0-9-161286-3399 (031); OEG-0-70-3404
NOTE 54p.; Filmed from best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Interpersonal Competence; *Language Instruction; Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; Teacher Programs; Teacher Workshops; Teaching Skills

ABSTRACT

The over-all purpose of this research project was to improve teacher efficiency in the undergraduate special education program at Southern Connecticut State College through the training of prospective teachers in the following three areas: interpersonal skills, attitudes and values toward minority groups, and clinical teaching approaches for language. It was hypothesized that the experimental groups attending workshops in each of the three areas would improve their interpersonal skills, acceptance of themselves, acceptance of others, values and attitudes toward minorities, and skills in the teaching of linguistics. The control group was comprised of students who volunteered for the experimental workshops, but who were unable to participate because of conflicts in scheduling. Measurement of the effect of the workshops was made using self-rating instruments before and after the workshops. Analysis of the results shows that subjects in the Interpersonal Skills Workshop did not feel that they improved their interpersonal skills or their acceptance of themselves or others. The subjects who participated in the Attitudes and Values Workshop did not feel that they improved their attitudes toward minorities. However, the participants of the Linguistics Workshop did feel that they had improved their language teaching skills. (HMD)

ED 096307

FINAL REPORT

SP

INCREASING TEACHING EFFICIENCY THROUGH A PROGRAM OF PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT AND ENRICHMENT OF PERCEPTUAL - LINGUISTIC AND MOTOR SKILLS IN PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

Special Project

Grant No. OEG-0-9-161286-3399 (031) &
OEG-0-70-3704

Esther Hirsch Mluskoff, Ph.D.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Southern Connecticut State College

New Haven, Connecticut

SP008 437

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	ii
Chapter	
I. Background	1
II. Method	8
III. Results	15
IV. Discussion	28
References	36
Appendix A. Workshop Evaluation Form	38
Appendix B. Rating Scales	40

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Background Characteristics of E and C Groups	8
2	Chi Square Values for E_{IPS} and C Groups on Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire	16
3	Chi Square Values for E_{IPS} and C Groups on Acceptance of Self Items on Self-Other Scale	17
4	Chi Square Values for E_{IPS} and C Groups on Acceptance of Others Items on Self-Other Scale	18
5	Chi Square Values for E_{A-V} and C Groups on Attitudes and Values Scale Items on Cultural Views of Minority Groups	20
6	Chi Square Values for E_{A-V} and C Groups on Attitudes and Values Scale Items on Personal Involvement with Minority Groups	22
7	Chi Square Values for E_{A-V} and C Groups on Attitudes and Values Scale Items on Educational Views of Minority Groups	23
8	Chi Square Values for E_{L} and C Groups on Linguistic Scale Items	25

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Since its inception, the goals and the content of this special project have changed substantially. Therefore, the history of the project is briefly described to provide an understanding of how the revised goals, the content, and results of this special project evolved.

History of Project.

In 1968 a planning grant was awarded to the Special Education Department at Southern Connecticut State College to establish a program of personal analysis as a component of the undergraduate program of teacher preparation. The purpose of the project was to expose prospective teachers to techniques of learning about themselves and the dynamics of learning.

In 1969, two different areas of training were instituted: (1) perceptual-motor training based on the movigenic curriculum (Barsch, 1964) conducted by Ray Barsch, and (2) language training conducted by Eleanor Semel.

In 1970, Barsch and Semel left the faculty of Southern Connecticut State College. Consequently, it was necessary to "re-think" the direction of the project. Faculty members with qualifications and interests in the project were enlisted to modify the project in directions that they thought would be most productive.

On the basis of the "re-thinking" of the project, three new areas of training were instituted in 1970. These three training areas constitute the final content of the project, and they are the foci of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

this final report. These three areas are: (1) Interpersonal Skills Workshop conducted by Stuart Gerber, (2) Attitudes and Values Workshop conducted by Arnold Fassler, and (3) Linguistics Workshop conducted by Esther B. Minskoff.

General Goal.

The overall goal of this Special Project was to improve teacher efficiency through innovations in the content of the undergraduate training program in Special Education.

Traditionally, undergraduate Special Education training programs have stressed courses in which the students learn about the characteristics of various handicapped children as well as methods for diagnosing and treating them. The stress in such training programs has been on the handicapped child, and not on the qualities and needs of the prospective teacher. An underlying premise of this Special Project is that it is as important to concentrate on the characteristics of the prospective teacher as it is to concentrate on the characteristics of the handicapped.

A special education teacher socially interacts with her handicapped students. Therefore, it is important for the prospective teacher to be aware of her personality characteristics and her social skills. In addition, she must be guided to develop more positive personality characteristics and social skills. There is growing evidence that such guidance can be provided by sensitivity training (Rogers, 1969).

In addition to having the prospective teacher be aware of her personality and social skills, she must also be made aware of the attitudes she holds towards her handicapped students. A large pro-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

portion of students in special classes, especially for the mentally retarded, are members of minority groups (Dunn, 1968; President's Committee on Mental Retardation, 1969; Franks, 1971; Hurley, 1971). Consequently, the prospective teacher must be made aware of her attitudes, values, and stereotypes regarding minority groups.

Finally, it is necessary to concentrate on the educational role of the prospective teacher. This role is in the process of radical change from that of a teacher of a self-contained special class to a resource teacher who uses diagnostic and clinical teaching with various types of exceptional children (Dunn, 1968). To train prospective teachers to take on this new role of resource teacher, there must be the development of diagnostic and remedial skills in areas such as language, perception, and academics.

Consequently, the over-all purpose of this project has been to improve teacher efficiency in the undergraduate Special Education program through the training of prospective teachers in the following three areas: (1) interpersonal skills, (2) attitudes and values toward minority groups, and (3) clinical teaching approaches for linguistics, or language.

Specific Goals of Three Training Areas.

Interpersonal Skills Workshop. The teacher's personality and her social skills are among the most significant variables in the classroom (Getzels and Jackson, 1963). There have been indications of increased academic gains in students with teachers who have positive personality traits (Aspy, 1965; Truax and Tatum, 1966; Scheuer, 1971). It seems

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that it may be possible to train certain positive social skills through sensitivity training (Schmuck, 1968; Rogers, 1969). Consequently, an Interpersonal Skills Workshop which utilized techniques from sensitivity training and exercises to develop understanding of self and others was instituted as part of this special project.

The Interpersonal Skills Workshop provided a loosely structured group experience to help prospective teachers improve their skills in communication, mutual understanding, and group participation. In addition, they were helped to analyze, in great depth, the feelings and interpersonal processes they experienced in the group.

On the basis of the nature of the Interpersonal Skills Workshop, three hypotheses were posited.

1. Subjects who participate in the Interpersonal Skills Workshop (E_{IPS} group) will have increased interpersonal skills when compared with subjects who do not participate in the Workshop (C group).
2. The E_{IPS} group will have increased acceptance of themselves when compared with the C group.
3. The E_{IPS} group will have increased acceptance of others when compared with the C group.

Attitudes and Values Workshop. Most of the prospective teachers in special education at Southern Connecticut State College are white and middle class. A large number of the handicapped children they will eventually teach are black, or Spanish speaking, and lower class (Franks, 1971). Consequently, the Attitudes and Values Workshop was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

instituted for the purpose of guiding prospective teachers to analyze their attitudes and values toward minority group handicapped children. As a result of this analysis, prospective teachers with positive attitudes and values toward such children were encouraged to teach in urban settings. Emphasis was placed on modifying those prospective teachers with negative attitudes and values toward minority group children. If this did not seem effective with certain students, then they were encouraged to teach white, middle class handicapped children in surburban settings.

On the basis of the nature of the Attitudes and Values Workshop, three hypotheses were projected.

1. Subjects who participate in the Attitudes and Values Workshop (E_{A-V} group) will have less negative views of the culture of minority groups and less stereotypes when compared with subjects who do not participate in the Workshop (C group).
2. The E_{A-V} group will have less fear of minority groups and greater desire for personal involvement with such groups when compared with the C group.
3. The E_{A-V} group will have more positive educational values for minority groups when compared with C group.

Linguistics Workshop. The new role of resource teacher projected for future special educators (Dunn, 1968) applies to teachers of all exceptionalities, and not just teachers of the learning disabled (Reynolds and Balow, 1972). The skills of such a resource teacher are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

two-fold. First, she must have the ability to adjust teaching methods and materials to the learning characteristics of the handicapped child, whether he is mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, or learning disabled. In addition, she must have the ability to provide appropriate teaching activities and materials in areas such as language, perception, and academics.

The Linguistics Workshop was designed to train prospective teachers in both of these areas; i.e., the ability to adjust methods and materials to any type of exceptional child, and the ability to provide appropriate methods and materials in the area of language.

To train prospective teachers to adjust their methods and materials, a practicum was used in conjunction with demonstration workshops. The prospective teachers were trained to modify methods and materials for three types of children: normal pre-schoolers; black, lower class pre-schoolers; and mentally retarded pre-schoolers.

To train prospective teachers to provide appropriate teaching methods and materials in the area of language, the model of communication underlying the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Kirk, McCarthy, and Kirk, 1968) was used. The 12 language areas encompassed by this model have been effectively trained in different types of handicapped children (Minskoff, 1967; Wiseman, 1965; 1967). The prospective teachers were trained to use the teaching activities of the MWM Program for Developing Language Abilities (Minskoff, Wiseman, and Minskoff, 1972).

On the basis of the nature of the Linguistic Workshop, the following hypotheses were posited.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Subjects who participate in the Linguistics Workshop (E_L group) will have more positive feelings that the development of handicapped children can be influenced when compared with subjects who do not participate in the Workshop (C group).
2. The E_L group will show more positive feelings that certain teachings should be stressed with the handicapped when compared with the C group.
3. The E_L group will show more positive feelings about their abilities to develop specific skills and abilities in their handicapped students when compared with the C group.
4. The E_L group will show more positive feelings about their abilities to diagnose the learning problems of their handicapped students when compared with the C group.
5. The E_L group will show more positive feelings about their abilities to remediate the learning problems of their handicapped students when compared with the C group.

CHAPTER II

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

METHOD

Subjects.

All Ss were full time undergraduates enrolled in special education. There were three different E groups corresponding to each of the three different areas of training. The following are the abbreviations for each of the E groups:

E_{IPS} - E group in the Interpersonal Skills Workshop,

E_{A-V} - E group in the Attitudes and Values Workshop,

E_{L} - E group in the Linguistics Workshop.

There was one C group which was compared to each of the three E groups. The C group was made up of students who had volunteered for the E groups, but were not included because of scheduling conflicts. Therefore, the E and C groups were alike in that all Ss had volunteered to participate in the project workshops.

The background characteristics of the E and C groups are shown in Table 1. The C group, by chance, had more blacks than the three E groups. The groups also differed in terms of the ratio of female to males. None of the differences on race or sex was significant for the groups.

TABLE 1
Background Characteristics
of E and C Groups

Group	N	Female	Male	White	Black
E_{IPS}	16	13	3	16	0
E_{A-V}	18	16	2	17	1
E_{Ling}	16	16	0	16	0
C	16	14	2	13	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Procedure.

Ss were recruited for the project during the first week of each semester. The project director explained the project to each special education class at the sophomore, junior, and senior levels. Students who were interested in participating in one, two, or all three workshops filled out schedules of their free times. Workshop schedules were then arranged on the basis of the times at which the greatest number of volunteers were available.

Each of the three workshops involved 12 weekly sessions of two hours each. During the first session the Ss were pre-tested, and at the last session they were post-tested. Each workshop had 12 to 18 students per semester.

Because participation in the workshops was voluntary, attendance, especially during exam periods, was a problem. Therefore, only Ss who attended 11 out of 12 workshop sessions were used as Ss for the statistical analysis.

Those students who volunteered to participate in a project workshop, but could not do so because of scheduling problems were placed in the C group. The C group was pre- and post-tested at the same times as the E groups.

At the end of each semester, the students in each workshop made evaluations. The evaluation form used is in Appendix A.

Following is a description of the specific procedures used in each of the three Workshops.

Interpersonal Skills Workshop. In this workshop the "T-Group" style of open-ended discussion was used. The leader was non-directive,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

but provided observations and interpretations, and suggested activities to help the group explore and resolve issues as they emerged.

There were training exercises aimed at increasing specific interpersonal skills, such as communication, observation, empathy, teamwork, competition, trust-building, help-giving, leadership, and group decision making. In addition, there were brief lectures and theoretical presentations related to the experience based learnings of the T-Group exercises. Explicit skill training was timed to respond to the group needs. For example, "Role Reversal" was used to analyze troubled interactions. Students were asked to role-play themselves and those in or out of the group with whom there was a problem. Feedback and discussion then followed.

There were also "application" exercises and discussions in which consideration was given to the relevance and use of workshop learning in everyday special education teaching.

Attitudes and Values Workshop. To have the students become aware of their attitudes toward minority groups, there were extensive, intensive discussions. Some of the early discussions were based on the items of the Attitudes and Values Scale. Students were guided to analyze their feelings toward various minority groups in different types of situations.

To modify the students' attitudes so as to be more positive toward minority groups, movies, readings, and guest lecturers were used. Movies such as "Black History - Lost, Stolen Strayed" narrated by Bill Cosby, "Derrick", which is about a black child in a ghetto school, and three movies on ghetto schools in New York City and Chicago were used. Readings included several anthologies of black poetry and descriptions of inner city movements. Some of the guest lecturers were a black director of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

special education, the director of residential care at the New Haven Regional Center, and a drug addict. The purpose of these presentations was to have the students learn to empathize with minority groups and their position in a discriminatory setting.

Linguistics Workshop. To train the students to provide language development activities, a lecture-demonstration approach was combined with a practicum. Fundamental to the planning of this workshop was the premise that students can best learn to teach by actually teaching. Every other weekly session was devoted to descriptions and demonstrations of various linguistic activities. At these sessions the students would try the activities with their fellow workshop students. In the following weekly session they would use these activities with an individual child.

Pre-school children were used for the practicum because most children at this level require language training. Every student spent two sessions with each of the three following types of children (for a total of six practicum sessions with children):

1. normal 4 and 5 year olds enrolled in the laboratory nursery school at Southern Connecticut State College,
2. lower class, black 4 and 5 year olds in a day care center, and
3. handicapped 3, 4, and 5 year olds enrolled in the nursery school of the Association for Retarded Children.

The teaching activities used were based on the conceptual model of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Kirk, McCarthy, and Kirk, 1968). However, the students were not taught to give or even interpret this test. In addition, all psychological terminology was avoided, and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

everyday terms were used. The teaching activities of the MWM Program for Developing Language Abilities (Minskoff, Wiseman, & Minskoff, 1972) were used. The students were trained to adapt these activities to the specific learning characteristics of each child with whom they worked.

Measuring Instruments.

Interpersonal Skills Workshop. Two measuring instruments were used to evaluate the students who participated in the Interpersonal Skills Workshop. The Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire (IPSQ Form P) was developed for this project by Drezek (1971). The IPSQ Form is a 20 item self-rating scale which measures such broad interpersonal areas as emotional stability, understanding of self and others, ability to communicate, and group management skills. Drezek (1971) reports a test-retest reliability coefficient of .67 for 67 special education undergraduates over a three week interval.

The second instrument used was the Self-Other Scale (S-O Form) developed by Berger (1952). The scale yields two scores, self acceptance and acceptance of others. The self acceptance aspects of the scale measures the extent to which a person accepts, uses, and values his own standards and behaviors. There are 36 self-rating items for the self acceptance scale with split-half reliability coefficients ranging from .74 to .89 (Berger, 1952)

The acceptance of others aspect of the scale measures the extent to which a person accepts, relates to, and helps others as peers. There are 28 self-rating items for the acceptance of others scales with split half reliability coefficients ranging from .77 to .88 (Berger, 1952).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Both the IPSQ and the S-O forms are completely reproduced in Appendix B.

Attitudes and Values Workshop. The Attitudes and Values Scales, which is shown in its entirety in Appendix A, was devised for this project by the project director. This 63 item self-rating scale was, in part, based on the scales developed by Faunce (1969) and Robinson (1971). This scale measures three variables: views and stereotypes concerning the culture of minority groups, the degree of personal involvement with minority groups, and the views on the type of education that should be given to minority groups.

The test - re-test reliability coefficient for the 16 Ss in the C group was .76. The period of time between the test and the re-test was 12 weeks. This reliability coefficient indicates that the variables measured by the Attitudes and Values Scale are stabile overtime.

Linguistics Workshop. The Linguistics Rating Scale was expressly devised for this project by the project director. This scale, too, is in Appendix B. It includes 30 self-rating items. The variables measured with this scale are the student's views on:

1. the degree to which a handicapped child's development can be influenced,
2. the stress on specific teachings in the curriculum for the handicapped,
3. the student's projected teaching abilities,
4. the student's projected diagnostic abilities,
5. the student's projected ability to provide remediation,
6. the classroom social climate,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. discipline, and
8. teaching strategies for children having learning difficulties.

The test - re-test reliability coefficient for the 16 Ss in the C group was .65. The period of time between the test and the re-test was 12 weeks. This reliability coefficient indicates the variable measured by the Linguistics Rating Scale are relatively stabile over time.

CHAPTER III

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RESULTS

The differences of the E and C subjects' self-ratings before and after the workshops constitute the basic data of this project. Such subjective data seemed to be more appropriately analyzed with non-parametric statistics. Therefore, chi squares were used for all data analyses in this project. These chi squares were applied to each item of all the rating scales rather than to total scores because the individual items involve differing foci of interest to this project.

Interpersonal Skills Workshop. The interpersonal skills of the E_{IPS} and C groups were measured with the Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire. The chi square values for the difference scores of the E_{IPS} and C groups for each of the 20 items of this Questionnaire are in Table 2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

Chi Square Values for E_{IPS} and C Groups on Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire

ITEM NO.	Chi Square	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
1	1.60	11	2.42
2	.24	12	4.04
3	2.14	13	3.94
4	1.18	14	.80
5	.50	15	.24
6	12.38 **	16	3.12
7	8.81 *	17	2.28
8	4.44	18	2.00
9	0	19	2.86
10	5.60	20	2.48

*Significant at .02 level
**Significant at .01 level

Statistical significance was obtained for only 2 items, item #6, "I live up to my ideals," and item #7, "I am an influential member in groups I belong to." It is possible that the E_{IPS} subjects felt more influential in groups as a result of their positive experiences in the sensitivity training workshop. However, the over-all findings of the Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire do not support the first hypothesis concerning the increased interpersonal skills of the E_{IPS} group.

The subjects' acceptance of self was measured by 36 items on the Self-Other Scale. The chi square values for the E_{IPS} and C groups on these items

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are in Table 3. The following item was the only one found significant out of the 36 items, "When I have to address a group, I get self conscious and have difficulty saying things well." This item, like item #7 of the

TABLE 3

Chi Square Values for E_{TPS} and C

Groups on Acceptance of Self Items on Self-Other Scale

ITEM NO.	Chi Square	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
1	.14	34	1.20
2	.64	35	2.88
6	.30	37	.16
7	.16	38	2.24
8	3.00	40	.24
9	2.30	41	2.36
11	3.38	42	1.96
12	2.78	45	.48
13	1.40	48	.18
14	1.57	51	2.38
15	.68	52	2.12
16	.42	53	1.00
17	3.65	58	1.67
18	2.60	59	5.69
20	2.70	61	.02
24	.50	62	2.61
28	3.52	63	8.76 *

*Significant at .02 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire, involves the E_{IPS} subjects' more positive views of their status in a group. However, the over-all data in Table 3 do not support the second hypothesis concerning the increased self acceptance of the E_{IPS} group.

The subjects' acceptance of others was measured by 28 items on the Self-Other Scale. The chi square values for the E_{IPS} and C groups on these items are in Table 4. None of the chi squares for these 28 items was significant. Thus, there was no support for the third hypothesis concerning the increased acceptance of others of the E_{IPS} group.

TABLE 4

Chi Square Values for the E_{IPS} and C Groups on Acceptance of Others Items on Self-Other Scale

ITEM NO.	Chi Square	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
3	1.32	33	.18
4	3.28	36	2.30
5	2.08	39	2.04
10	3.34	43	.18
19	1.80	44	2.66
21	1.24	46	3.32
22	2.93	47	3.23
23	.82	49	2.40
25	.28	50	1.64
26	.64	54	3.50
27	2.04	55	5.04
29	3.46	56	5.82
30	4.68	57	.82
32	.18	60	3.64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Of the 84 chi squares on the data from the Interpersonal Skills Workshop, only 4 were significant. Although there may have been some slight improvement in the E_{IPS} subjects' perceptions of their role in groups, it must be concluded that the over-all data do not support any of the 3 hypotheses regarding the effects of the Interpersonal Skills Workshop.

Attitudes and Values Workshop. The attitudes and values of the E_{A-V} and C groups were measured with the Attitudes and Values Questionnaire. The 63 items on this Questionnaire were divided into 3 categories; those involving cultural views of minority groups, personal involvement with minority groups, and educational views of minority groups.

The chi square values for the 33 items involving the subjects' views of the culture of minority groups are in Table 5. Three of these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5

Chi Square Values for the E_{A-V} and C Groups on Attitudes and Values Scales Items on Cultural Views of Minority Groups

ITEM NO.	Chi Square	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
1	3.20	35	1.87
4	2.11	38	.41
5	1.80	39	.90
8	6.55 *	41	1.99
9	2.51	44	2.69
11	2.44	46	5.29
12	1.62	47	1.95
13	.43	48	2.99
15	3.63	50	2.86
17	1.11	51	2.53
19	3.59	55	2.32
23	2.53	56	8.51 **
24	.78	59	1.87
28	3.06	60	3.32
30	6.55 *	61	2.95
31	3.41	63	4.03
34	3.45		

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .02 level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

33 items were significant:

item #8 - "It is more important to teach black, retarded children to respect authority than white retarded children."

item #30 - "Black women have more children so they can get more welfare money."

item #56 - "Black people are not ready to have full job and housing equality now, but they will be in the future."

The significant findings for these items indicate the beginnings of positive changes in the E_{A-V} subjects' stereotypes regarding minority groups. However, because of 30 of these 33 items were not significant, the first hypothesis concerning the less negative views of the culture of minority groups of the E_{A-V} subjects must be rejected.

The chi square values for the 21 items involving the subjects' personal involvement with minority groups are in Table 6. Three of these

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6

Chi Square Values for the E_{A-V} and C Groups on Attitudes and Values Scale Items on Personal Involvement with Minority Groups

ITEM NO.	Chi Square	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
3	4.28	29	1.05
7	.72	33	1.36
10	2.35	37	8.56 **
14	.42	40	3.38
16	3.11	42	5.28
18	2.19	49	.38
20	8.24 **	53	.03
22	.00	54	.00
25	4.74	57	1.42
27	2.83	58	.65
		62	6.00 *

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .02 level

chi squares were significant:

item #20 - "I am afraid of black people."

item #37 - "If I learned that one of my student's mother was a drug addict or an alcoholic, I would try to help the child and his mother."

item #62 - "I would rather teach minority retarded children such as Puerto Ricans and Indians than blacks."

The findings for item #20 are especially important as they seem to indicate a reduction in fear of minority groups on the part of the E_{A-V} group.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These findings seem to indicate the beginnings of a desire by the E_{A-V} group to have greater personal involvement with minority groups. However, because 18 of the 21 chi squares were not significant, the second hypothesis regarding the greater desire for personal involvement with minorities by the E_{A-V} group cannot be accepted.

In Table 7 there are the chi square values for the 20 items involving the subjects' views on the education to be given minorities. Two

---

TABLE 7

Chi Square Values for E_{A-V} and C Groups on Attitudes and Values Scale Items on Educational Views of Minority Groups

ITEM NO.	Chi Square	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
2	2.63	36	5.61
6	1.72	43	5.92
8	6.55 *	45	.56
13	.43	48	2.99
21	6.65 *	52	2.52
23	2.53	55	2.32
26	.86	59	1.87
28	3.06	60	3.32
31	3.41	61	2.95
32	.72	63	4.03

*Significant at .05 level

---

of these chi squares were significant:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

item #8 - "It is more important to teach black, retarded children to respect authority than white retarded children."

item #21 - "If a retarded girl becomes pregnant, she should be thrown out of school and she should not be allowed to return."

Item #8 was classified in 2 categories because it involves cultural views of minorities and resulting educational measures to be taken for these cultural characteristics. Item #21 involves general administrative policy rather than specific educational treatment. Therefore, these findings do not support the third hypothesis in which it was predicted that the E_{A-V} group would have more positive educational values for minorities.

The over-all findings for the Attitudes and Values Questionnaire seem to indicate only the beginnings of positive changes in the E_{A-V} group in terms of dispelling some common stereotypes regarding minorities and a reduction in the fear of minorities.

Linguistics Workshop. The items on the Linguistics Rating Scale were grouped into categories on the basis of the variables measured. These variables correspond to each of the 5 hypotheses projected the E_L group as well as supplementary information. The chi square values for each variable are shown in Table 8.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 8

Chi Square Values E_L and C Groups on Linguistic Scale Items

Variable	ITEM NO.	Chi Square
I. Degree of influence on handicapped child's development	1, 8, 13	11.64
II. Stress on Teaching the Handicapped	2, 9	2.09
III. Projected teaching abilities	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10 11, 12, 16, 17	10.66 *
IV. Present diagnostic abilities	22	1.06
V. Projected diagnostic abilities	23	13.86 *
VI. Knowledge of diagnostic tests	24	10.16 *
VII. Projected ability to remediate	25	9.88 *
VIII. Knowledge or remedial techniques	26	15.62 *
IX. Stress on discipline	19	1.40
X. Classroom atmosphere	20, 21	1.46
XI. Knowledge of restructuring strategies	28, 29	1.28
XII. Ability to restructure	30	0

*Significant at .01 level

The first variable listed in Table 8 involves the degree to which the sujbects believed that handicapped children's development could be influenced by education. Items #1, 8, and 13 were combined for this analysis. The resulting chi square was significant thereby supporting the first hypothesis in which it was predicted that the E_L group would have more positive feelings that the development of handicapped children could be influenced.

The second variable in Table 8 concerns the stress that should be given

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to certain teachings for the handicapped. The chi square values for this variable was not significant; therefore, the second hypothesis must be rejected.

The third variable involved the subjects' evaluations of their future teaching abilities. The obtained chi square value was significant, thus supporting the third hypothesis in which it was stated that the E_L group would have more positive feelings about their abilities to develop specific skills and abilities in their handicapped students.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth variables listed in Table 8 are related to the hypothesis which concerned the subjects' diagnostic abilities. The chi square for the groups' evaluation of their present abilities to diagnose their students' learning problems was not significant. However, the chi square for the groups' evaluations of their future abilities to diagnose learning problems was significant. In addition, the E_L group felt that they knew significantly more about diagnostic tests than the C group. Therefore, these findings seem to support the fourth hypothesis in which it was predicted that the E_L group would have more positive feelings about their abilities to diagnose learning problems in their handicapped students.

Variables 7 and 8 in Table 8 correspond to the hypothesis concerning the subjects' evaluation of their abilities to remediate their students' learning problems. Both the chi square for the subjects' projected abilities to remediate and the chi square for the knowledge of remedial techniques were statistically significant. Therefore, there is support for the hypothesis in which it was stated that the E_L group would have more positive feelings about their abilities to remediate the learning problems of their handicapped students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Additional data was obtained for the variables of stress on discipline, classroom atmosphere, and restructuring strategies. None of the chi-squares for these variables was significant. Of these 3 additional variables, the only one that was explicitly covered in the Linguistics Workshop involved restructuring strategies. There was an attempt to train the E_L subjects to modify their teachings methods and materials when the students were not mastering them. From the statistical results, this aspect of the Workshop was not effective.

The over-all findings for the Linguistics Workshop support 4 of the 5 projected hypotheses. Therefore, the Workshop seemed to be effective in developing in the E_L subjects a more positive view of their role in educating handicapped children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The findings of this project are specifically discussed in relation to each of the 3 workshops. In addition, the limitations of this project as well as the inclusion of the project findings in the special education training program at Southern Connecticut State College are discussed.

Interpersonal Skills Workshop. The results of the statistical analysis did not support any of the 3 hypotheses regarding the improved skills of the E_{IPS} group. Drezek (1971) conducted a study on undergraduates in special education at Southern Connecticut State College who participated in the Interpersonal Skills Workshop in the first year of this project. He found that his experimental group had improved interpersonal skills as measured by the Interpersonal Skills Questionnaire and improved acceptance of self and of others as measured by the Self-Other Scale. The discrepancy between Drezek's findings and those of this project may be due to the following factors: (a) Drezek used the paramatic analysis of covariance statistic, while the non-parametric chi square was used for this special project; (b) Drezek used a probability level of .10 for statistical significance, while .05 was used for this project; (c) Drezek analyzed total scores, while individual items were analyzed in this project, and (d) each group is a different entity varying in its responsiveness to sensitivity training. Gerber, who conducted the sensitivity training workshops for this project and for the Drezek study, found that the workshop groups differed each semester. Some groups provided their own structure and required minimal guidance and application exercises, while other groups lacked structure and required maximum guidance and application

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

exercises. It seems likely that all 4 factors probably were involved in the discrepant findings of the Drezek study and those of this project.

From the results of this study, it seems that sensitivity training may be effective in making students aware of their feelings regarding their interpersonal skills. However, it seems doubtful that changes in well-ingrained personality traits involving the students' social interactions can be modified through sensitivity training workshops incorporated in a teacher training program.

A more productive approach to personality variables in prospective teachers might be to pre-select students who have desirable personality traits rather than attempting to alter existing personality traits. It is likely that there are many different types of personality traits and interpersonal skills that are compatible with effective teacher-pupil social interactions, and not just one or a few types. Future research should be directed toward identifying the many different positive interpersonal skills as well as negative interpersonal skills; i.e., traits that are <u>not</u> compatible with effective teacher-pupil social interactions.

With the increasing surplus of special education teachers in many locales, pre-selection of prospective teachers may enable training programs to identify candidates with greater chances of teaching success, rather than accepting anyone who is interested in special education as has often been done. Students with positive personality traits and interpersonal skills would be encouraged to continue in special education, while those with negative characteristics would be channeled to other preparation programs where personality variables are not as critical for effectiveness.

The means for implementing such a pre-selection process involve 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

steps, first the identification of negative interpersonal traits, and secondly, the systematic identification of such traits in prospective teachers. Tests alone are probably not sufficiently valid or reliable indicators of such personality variables. It would seem imperative to have intensive interpersonal interactions between the faculty and the students to identify these variables. Sensitivity training might be an excellent medium for such intensive interpersonal interactions. Therefore, sensitivity training workshops might be required of all students beginning in a preparatory program so that those with negative personality traits could be discouraged from becoming special education teachers and those with positive traits could be encouraged to continue in special education.

Attitudes and Values Workshop. The statistical findings necessitate the rejection of the 3 hypotheses regarding the more positive attitudes and values of the E_{A-V} group to minorities. However, the analysis of the statistically significant items indicated a reduction in fear of minorities in the E_{A-V} group, and also a slightly more positive view of some aspects of the culture of minorities.

There were no significant changes in the views of the E_{A-V} group toward the type of education best suited for minorities. This is an especially important variable in light of the findings by Rubin, Krus, and Balow (1973) that average IQ children are being placed in special classes for the retarded on the basis of their social class. It seems that prospective teachers have strongly ingrained views toward the education for lower class and minority children, and these views are exceedingly difficult to modify.

There are 2 factors that may, in part, explain the statistical findings for the Attitudes and Values Workshop. First, 12 sessions may have had

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

inadequate time to guide students to become aware of their views of minorities, and also to modify these views. Secondly, some students may have authoritarian or prejudiced personalities (Allport, 1958). To change such a personality requires the modification of a whole life pattern. It is unlikely that this can be accomplished through a "talking" or workshop approach.

On the basis of the findings, it seems that assessment and modification, when possible, of the attitudes and values toward minorities of prospective special education teachers should be part of all preparatory programs. This would have to be done on an intensive basis throughout the first year of the students' program.

Those students with positive attitudes toward minorities would be encouraged to teach the many minority group children found in urban settings. Those students identified as having prejudiced personalities, or unalterable negative attitudes toward minorities, would be encouraged to teach middle class, suburban handicapped children. It might be deemed necessary that some, or even all, students with such prejudiced personalities would be encouraged to enter a field of preparation other than education. It is likely that most teachers of normal or handicapped children will have contact with lower social class and/or minority group children. If such students are allowed to continue in education, non-egalitarian practices such as those identified by Rubin, Krus, and Balow will never abate.

Linguistics Workshop. The statistical findings for the Linguistics Workshop supported 4 of the 5 hypotheses. Therefore, the E_L subjects had more positive views about their abilities to improve the development of handicapped children through diagnosing and treating their learning problems

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in language. It must be stressed that the students' feelings about their abilities were assessed, and not their actual abilities. However, the students feelings about their abilities are probably as important as their actual abilities.

These findings indicate that undergraduates can be trained as resource teachers. Therefore, a basic foundation for training highly specialized resource teachers can be laid when the students are undergraduates. This foundation can be built upon when the students enter graduate training. Therefore, the discontinuity of training where undergraduates are trained to teach one type of self contained class and then as graudates they are trained as resource teachers for all types of handicapped children can be avoided.

By contrasting the findings of the Linguistics Workshop with those of the Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes and Values Workshops, it might be concluded that it is more productive to train students to teach than to modify their personalities or attitudes. Therefore, training programs should be built around pre-selecting students with certain traits, and then concentrating on how to train these students to actually teach.

The Linguistics Workshop seemed to be an effective way of training students in highly specialized skills without the use of psychological and educational jargon, labels, classifications, and causative factors. By guiding the students to identify language problems, they were able to learn to treat these problems.

The Workshop also demonstrated that the best way to teach a student to teach is to allow him to immediately apply what he learns to actual children. The traditional dichotomy of courses vs. practicums and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and student teaching experiences in most undergraduate programs does not seem to be an effective way of teaching students to teach. Rather, each course involving how to identify or treat handicapped children's problems should include immediate application with actual children.

It would seem that training prospective teachers to diagnose and treat learning problems of all types of handicapped children should be the basic approach pervading all courses in a teacher training program. Students should be given training and experience in linguistics, perceptual-motor, and academic areas so that they can eventually deal with any type of problem in any type of handicapped child.

Limitations of the Project. There are 4 major limitations of this Project: (1) the nature of the subjects, (2) the amount of time, (3) the methods of assessment, and (4) the areas of training.

Both the E and C subjects of this project were volunteers. The C group was equivalent to the E group in that they were volunteers who could not participate in the Workshops because of scheduling problems. However, the degree of generalization from the E and C groups to all other students who did not volunteer is limited. Approximately ½ of all students asked to volunteer did so. However, the remaining ½ are qualitatively different in that they were unwilling to find out about their interpersonal skills, attitudes and values, and ways of improving their teaching abilities. How changes would be effected with those students who did not volunteer is a much more difficult problem to attack.

The number of workshop sessions was limited to 12. This was necessitated by the factor that the workshops had to be fitted into the semester schedule. It is likely that 12 sessions was not adequate time for any of the 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

workshops areas. Therefore, the findings should be viewed as minimal.

The method for assessing the 3 areas of training was through self-rating questionnaires. Although feelings are important indices of change, they certainly are not sufficient. Future studies of this nature should combine assessment of feelings with assessment of behavioral changes. For example, interpersonal skills can be behaviorally evaluated with instruments such as Flanders' interaction analysis (Amidon and Flanders, 1963).

The areas of training were circumscribed by the history of this project. For example, linguistics was just one of several areas in which the students might have been trained. Differing results might have been obtained had workshops on perceptual-motor or academic areas been given. The Attitudes and Values Workshop primarily stressed racial minorities. Had lower social class children been stressed differing results might have been obtained.

Inclusion of Project Findings in Special Education Curriculum. The findings of this project are being used as part of the basis of the re-conceptualization of the undergraduate training program in special education at Southern Connecticut State College. Because of the great numbers of students wanting to enter special education, it is becoming necessary to devise criteria for selecting prospective teachers who have greater chances of success. Obviously, the use of grades alone is not adequate. Pre-selection criteria involving the student's interpersonal skills and attitudes and values are being developed.

A non-categorical approach with various training modules is also being conceptualized for the undergraduate training program. This

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

approach will include training modules in various areas of competency such as behavior modification, linguistics, perception, and academics. The format of the Linguistics Workshop will provide the basis for developing these training modules.

This special project has enabled the special education department to try new approaches that would not have been possible without federal support. This project has opened new avenues of thinking for the faculty, and hopefully will improve the prospective teacher and the education she provides to her students.

REFERENCES

Allport, G.W. The Nature of Prejudice. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958.

Amidon, E.J. & Flanders, N.A. The Rose of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis: P.S. Amidon, 1963.

Aspy, D.N. A study of three facilitative conditions and their relationship to the achievement of third grade students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1965.

Barsch, R. The Movigenic Curriculum. Bulletin No. 25. Madison: Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction, 1964.

Berger, E. The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.

Drezek, S.F. Sensitivity training in the preparation of special education teachers. Unpublished master's thesis; Southern Connecticut State College, 1971.

Dunn, L.M. Special education for the mildly retarded. Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-24.

Faunce, R.W. Attitudes and characteristics of effective and not effective teachers of culturally disadvantaged children. Minneapolis: Minneapolis Public Schools, 1969.

Franks, D.J. Ethnic and Social status characteristics of children in E.M.R. and L.D. Classes. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 537.

Getzells, J.W. & Jackson, P.W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N.L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Rand McNally, 1963.

Hurley, O.L. Special education in the inner city: the social implications of placement. Paper presented at Conference on Diagnosis and Placement of the Mentally Retarded, President's Committee on Mental Retardation, Lake Arrowhead, California, March, 1971.

Kirk, S.A., McCarthy, J.J., & Kirk, W.D. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Revised edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

Minskoff, J.G. The effectiveness of a specific program based on language diagnosis in overcoming learning disabilities in mentally retarded-emotionally disturbed children. Final report, Project No. 6-8375, Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Division of Research. New York: Yeshiva University, 1967.

Minskoff, E.H., Wiseman, D.E., & Minskoff, J.G. The MWM Program for Developing Language Abilities. Ridgefield, New Jersey: Educational Performance Associates, 1972.

President's Committee on Mental Retardation. The six-hour retarded child. Washington, D.C.: Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped. Office of Education, 1969.

Reynold, M.C. & Balow, B. Categories and Variables in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 357-366.

Robinson, J.W. Interpersonal relationships of teachers in desegregated schools. Houston: Houston Baptist College, 1971.

Rogers, C.R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Rubin, R.A., Krus, P., & Balow, B. Factors in special class placement. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 525-533.

Scheuer, A.L. The relationship between personal altributes and effectiveness in teachers of the emotionally disturbed. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 723-732.

Schmuck, R. Helping teachers improve classroom group processes. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 1968, 4, 401-437.

Truax, C.B. & Tatum, C.R. An extension from the effective psychotherapeutic model to constructive personality change in pre-school children. Childhood Education, 1966, 42, 456.

Wiseman, D.E. The effects of an individualized remedial program on mentally retarded children with psycholinguistic disabilities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965.

Wiseman, D.E. Tutorial programming for the mentally retarded: a clinical research project. Paper presented at the Kennedy Foundation Scientific Symposium, Chicago, 1967.

APPENDIX A

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Esther Minskoff
Associate Professor

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Workshop _____ Class _____ Date _____

Please evaluate this workshop as honestly and completely as possible. Your name has not been requested so you can be as candid as you like.

1. Do you feel that you benefited from the workshop?

   Yes _____ No _____

   (a) If yes, how?

   (b) If no, why not?

2. What were the good points of the workshop?

3. What were the bad points of the workshop?

4. Compare the effectiveness of the workshop in training you to be a special education teacher with the effectiveness of your regular course work.

   (a) In what ways was your regular course work more helpful than the workshop?

   (b) In what ways was the workshop more helpful than your regular course work?

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

Workshop _____ Class _____ Date _____

5. What content or activities would you recommend adding to the workshop?

6. What content or activities would you recommend deleting from the workshop?

7. Make any comment about your experiences in the workshop that you feel would be helpful in improving it for future students?

APPENDIX B

NAME _____ DATE _____

IPSQ FORM P

This is a study of some of your attitudes toward your behavior with others. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself. Your own individual score will not be used, but everyone's scores pooled to see as a group how you rate yourselves. Therefore, your scores will be kept completely confidential. You are to respond to each item according to the following:

1 = Not at all true of myself
2 = Slightly true of myself
3 = About half-way true of myself
4 = Mostly true of myself
5 = Completely true of myself

_____ (1) I am confident of myself.

_____ (2) I can share other people's feelings.

_____ (3) When objectivity is called for, I resist the urge to take sides and play favorites.

_____ (4) I say what I feel.

_____ (5) I understand the impact other people have on my feelings and behavior.

_____ (6) I live up to my ideals.

_____ (7) I am an influential member in groups I belong to.

_____ (8) I understand the special ways in which people behave when they are in groups.

_____ (9) I understand the impact I have on other people's feelings and behavior.

_____ (10) When I have a personal problem I can handle it.

_____ (11) I know who I am.

_____ (12) I am stable and consistent in my relationships.

_____ (13) My opinions and insights influence other people.

_____ (14) I lead groups effectively.

_____ (15) I understand what motivates the behavior of people I know.

NAME _____ DATE _____

IPSQ FORM P

_____ (16) I am a good listener.

_____ (17) I don't fall apart, even when I'm quite upset.

_____ (18) If necessary, I can change my way of doing things to meet others' needs.

_____ (19) When other people are upset I can stay calm.

_____ (20) I understand what motivates my behavior.

APPENDIX B

SO FORM 1

This is a study of some of your attitudes. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself.

You are to respond to each question on the answer sheet according to the following scheme:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true of myself	Slightly true of myself	About halfway true of myself	Mostly true of myself	True of myself

Remember, the best answer is the one which applies to you.

1. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

2. I don't question my worth as a person, even if I think others do.

3. I can be comfortable with all varieties of people -- from the highest to the lowest.

4. I can become so absorbed in the work I'm doing that it doesn't bother me not to have any intimate friends.

5. I don't approve of spending time and energy in doing things for other people. I believe in looking to my family and myself more and letting others shift for themselves.

6. When people say nice things about me, I find it difficult to believe they really mean it. I think maybe they're kidding me or just aren't being sincere.

7. If there is any criticism or anyone says anthing about me, I just can't take it.

8. I don't say much at social affairs because I'm afraid that people will criticize me or laugh if I say the wrong thing.

9. I realize that I'm not living very effectively but I just don't believe that I've got it in me to use my energies in better ways.

10. I don't approve of doing favors for people. If you're too agreeable they'll take advantage of you.

11. I look on most of the feelings and impulses I have toward people as being quite natural and acceptable.

12. Something inside me just won't let me be satisfied with any job I've done -- if it turns out well, I get a very smug feeling that this is beneath me, I shouldn't be satisfied with this, this isn't a fair test.

13. I feel different from other people. I'd like to have the feeling of security that comes from knowing I'm not too different from others.

14. I'm afraid for people that I like to find out what I'm really like, for fear they'd be disappointed in me.

15. I am frequently bothered by feelings of inferiority.

16. Because of other people, I haven't been able to achieve as much as I should have.

17. I am quite shy and self-conscious in social situations.

18. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

19. I usually ignore the feelings of others when I'm accomplishing some important end.

20. I seem to have a real inner strength in handling things. I'm on a pretty solid foundation and it makes me pretty sure of myself.

21. There's no sense in compromising. When people have values I don't like, I just don't care to have much to do with them.

22. The person you marry may not be perfect, but I believe in trying to get him (or her) to change along desirable lines.

23. I see no objection to stepping on other people's toes a little if it'll help get me what I want in life.

24. I feel self-conscious when I'm with people who have a superior position to mine in business or at school.

25. I try to get people to do what I want them to do, in one way or another.

26. I often tell people what they should do when they're having trouble in making a decision.

27. I enjoy myself most when I'm alone, away from other people.

28. I think I'm neurotic or something.

29. I feel neither above nor below the people I meet.

30. Sometimes people misunderstand me when I try to keep them from making mistakes that could have an important effect on their lives.

31. Very often I don't try to be friendly with people because I think they won't like me.

32. There are very few times when I compliment people for their talents or jobs they've done.

33. I enjoy doing little favors for people even if I don't know them well.

34. I feel that I'm a person of worth, on an equal plane with others.

35. I can't avoid feeling guilty about the way I feel toward certain people in my life.

36. I prefer to be alone rather than have close friendships with any of the people around me.

37. I'm not afraid of meeting new people. I feel that I'm a worthwhile person and there's no reason why they should dislike me.

38. I sort of only half-believe in myself.

39. I seldom worry about other people. I'm really pretty self-centered.

40. I'm very sensitive. People say things and I have a tendency to think they're criticizing me or insulting me in some way and later when I think of it, they may not have meant anything like that at all.

41. I think I have certain abilities and other people say so too, but I wonder if I'm not giving them an importance way beyond what they deserve.

42. I feel confident that I can do something about the problems that may arise in the future.

43. I believe that people should get credit for their accomplishments but I very seldom come across work that deserves praise.

44. When someone asks for advice about some personal problem, I'm most likely to say, "It's up to you to decide," rather than tell him what he should do.

45. I guess I put on a show to impress people. I know I'm not the person I pretend to be.

46. I feel that for the most part one has to fight his way through life. That means that people who stand in the way will be hurt.

47. I can't help feeling superior (or inferior) to most of the people I know.

48. I do not worry or condemn myself if other people pass judgment against me.

49. I don't hesitate to urge people to live by the same high set of values which I have for myself.

50. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.

51. I don't feel very normal, but I want to feel normal.

52. When I'm in a group I usually don't say much for fear of saying the wrong thing.

53. I have a tendency to sidestep my problems.

54. If people are weak and inefficient I'm inclined to take advantage of them. I believe you must be strong to achieve your goals.

55. I'm easily irritated by people who argue with me.

56. When I'm dealing with younger persons, I expect them to do what I tell them.

57. I don't see much point to doing things for others unless they can do you some good later on.

58. Even when people do think well of me, I feel sort of guilty because I know I must be fooling them -- that if I were really to be myself, they wouldn't think well of me.

59. I feel that I'm on the same level as other people and that helps to establish good relations with them.

60. If someone I know is having difficulty in working things out for himself, I like to tell him what to do.

61. I feel that people are apt to react differently to me than they would normally react to other people.

62. I live too much by other people's standards.

63. When I have to address a group, I get self-conscious and have difficulty saying things well.

64. If I didn't always have such hard luck, I'd accomplish much more than I have.

APPENDIX B

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Esther H. Minskoff
Associate Professor

LINGUISTICS RATING SCALE

Name _____ Class _____ Date _____

This is a study of your attitudes toward teaching language. Please check the one choice for each item that best describes your feelings. There is no right answer. The best answer is the one that you feel truly describes you.

1. I believe that a handicapped child's language development (i.e., his grammar, vocabulary, and speech) can be influenced to a:

   _____ (a) strong degree.
   _____ (b) moderate degree.
   _____ (c) limited degree.
   _____ (d) cannot be influenced at all.

2. Language development in the curriculum for handicapped children should be given:

   _____ (a) strong emphasis.
   _____ (b) moderate emphasis.
   _____ (c) limited emphasis.
   _____ (d) no emphasis.

3. When I teach, I will be able to provide:

   _____ (a) excellent language training for my students.
   _____ (b) adequate language training for my students.
   _____ (c) poor language training for my students.
   _____ (d) I will <u>not</u> be able to provide language training at all.

4. In terms of specific lessons for teaching grammar (e.g., tense, action sentences, sentences showing cause and effect), I will be able to provide:

   _____ (a) excellent lessons.
   _____ (b) adequate lessons.
   _____ (c) poor lessons.
   _____ (d) I will <u>not</u> be able to provide any lessons.

5. In terms of specific lessons for developing vocabulary (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives) appropriate to the development level of my students, I will be able to provide:

   _____ (a) excellent lessons.
   _____ (b) adequate lessons.
   _____ (c) poor lessons.
   _____ (d) I will <u>not</u> be able to provide any lessons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LINGUISTICS RATING SCALE

Name _____ Class _____ Date _____

6. In terms of specific lessons in auditory perception (e.g., discrimination of letter sounds, rhyming), I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent lessons.
_____ (b) adequate lessons.
_____ (c) poor lessons.
_____ (d) I will not be able to provide any lessons.

7. In terms of specific lessons in visual perception (e.g., figure ground relations, spatial relations, shape discrimination), I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent lessons.
_____ (b) adequate lessons.
_____ (c) poor lessons.
_____ (d) I will not be able to provide any lessons.

8. I believe that it is possible to influence a handicapped child's reading ability to a:

_____ (a) strong degree.
_____ (b) moderate degree.
_____ (c) limited degree.
_____ (d) cannot be influenced at all.

9. Reading instruction in the curriculum for handicapped children should be given:

_____ (a) strong emphasis.
_____ (b) moderate emphasis.
_____ (c) limited emphasis.
_____ (d) no emphasis.

10. When I teach, I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent reading instruction for my students.
_____ (b) adequate reading instruction for my students.
_____ (c) poor reading instruction for my students.
_____ (d) I will not be able to provide any reading instruction.

11. In terms of specific lessons for teaching reading through a phonics approach (e.g., word families, sound blending), I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent lessons.
_____ (b) adequate lessons.
_____ (c) poor lessons.
_____ (d) I will not be able to provide any phonics lessons.

LINGUISTICS RATING SCALE

Name _____ Class _____ Date _____

12. In terms of specific lessons for teaching reading through a look and say or sight approach (e.g., experience charts, kinesthetics methods), I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent lessons.
_____ (b) adequate lessons.
_____ (c) poor lessons.
_____ (d) I will <u>not</u> be able to provide any lessons using a look and say method.

13. I believe that it is possible to train intellectual abilities in handicapped children to a:

_____ (a) strong degree.
_____ (b) moderate degree.
_____ (c) limited degree.
_____ (d) <u>not</u> possible at all.

14. I believe that:

_____ (a) memory skills are more important than thinking skills in educating retarded children.
_____ (b) thinking skills are more important than memory skills in educating retarded children.
_____ (c) both memory and thinking skills are equally important in educating retarded children.
_____ (d) don't know if memory or thinking skills are more important.

15. I believe that in the education of retarded children it is important to:

_____ (a) give primary stress to concrete areas that require rote memory and secondary stress to abstract areas that require problem solving skills.
_____ (b) give primary stress to abstract areas that require problem solving skills and secondary stress to concrete areas that require rote memory.
_____ (c) give equal stress to concrete and abstract areas, whenever possible.
_____ (d) don't know.

LINGUISTICS RATING SCALE

Name _____ Class _____ Date _____

16. In terms of specific lessons for training memory (e.g., labelling and kinesthetic cues for visual memory and rhythm for auditory memory), I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent lessons.
_____ (b) adequate lessons.
_____ (c) poor lessons.
_____ (d) I will <u>not</u> be able to provide any lessons for training memory.

17. In terms of specific lessons for training thinking processes (e.g., classifying, associating, absurdities), I will be able to provide:

_____ (a) excellent lessons.
_____ (b) adequate lessons.
_____ (c) poor lessons.
_____ (d) I will <u>not</u> be able to provide any lessons to train thinking processes.

18. I believe that whenever possible the teacher should ask questions which require:

_____ (a) short student answers which require minimal thinking skills and verbalization.
_____ (b) long student answers which require much thinking skills and verbalization.
_____ (c) don't know.

19. I believe that maintaining discipline is:

_____ (a) one of the most important aspects of effective teaching.
_____ (b) is only necessary so teaching can take place, but is not important in itself.
_____ (c) <u>not</u> important for effective teaching.

20. I believe that the teacher should:

_____ (a) do most of the talking in the classroom and the students should speak only when called upon.
_____ (b) do the same amount of talking as the students do.
_____ (c) talk as little as possilbe, while the students should talk as much as possible.

LINGUISTICS RATING SCALE

Name _____ Class _____ Date _____

21. I believe that there should be:

_____ (a) complete freedom for the children to talk and move around the classroom.
_____ (b) some freedom for the children to occasionally talk and move around the classroom.
_____ (c) little freedom for the children to talk and move around the classroom.

22. When I am in the classroom, I am:

_____ (a) strongly aware of the language characteristics of the students.
_____ (b) moderately aware of the language characteristics of the students.
_____ (c) somewhat aware of the language characteristics of the students.
_____ (d) not aware of the language characteristics of the students.

23. When I teach, I:

_____ (a) will definitely be able to identify children with possible learning disabilities in language.
_____ (b) may be able to identify children with possible learning disabilities in language.
_____ (c) will not be able to identify children with possible learning disabilities in language.

24. My knowledge of diagnostic tests such as the ITPA, Wepman, Frostig, and Purdue is:

_____ (a) excellent.
_____ (b) moderate.
_____ (c) limited.
_____ (d) none.

25. When I teach, I think I will be:

_____ (a) very good at training children with learning disabilities in language.
_____ (b) adequate at training children with learning disabilities in language.
_____ (c) poor at training children with learning disabilities in language.
_____ (d) totally unable to train children with learning disabilities in language.

LINGUISTICS RATING SCALE

Name _____ Class _____ Date _____

26. My knowledge of remedial technique such as the Frostig, Fernald, Kephart is:

_____ (a) excellent.
_____ (b) moderate.
_____ (c) limited.
_____ (d) none.

27. A child's incorrect response to a question is important because:

_____ (a) it shows he has not mastered the underlying process
_____ (b) it can be used to teach the child the desired learning.
_____ (c) both of above.
_____ (d) child's incorrect response is not particularly important.

28. When a child answers a question incorrectly, it is best to give him the correct answer so he is not frustrated and so the lesson will run smoothly:

_____ (a) strongly agree.
_____ (b) agree.
_____ (c) disagree.
_____ (d) strongly disagree.

29. When a child answers a question incorrectly, it is best to lead him to the correct response by re-structuring the teaching situation even if he meets frustration and the lesson is slowed.

_____ (a) strongly agree.
_____ (b) agree.
_____ (c) disagree.
_____ (d) strongly disagree

30. When a child responds incorrectly, I will be able to re-structure the teaching situation to lead him to the correct response (e.g., by providing cues in another sense modality, using a recognition instead of a recall task):

_____ (a) very well.
_____ (b) adequately.
_____ (c) poorly.
_____ (d) not at all.